

IV. REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-22 are presented for further consideration.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-8, stand rejected under 35USC102(e) on the basis of the cited reference Miloslavsky, U.S. Patent No. 6,418,146. Claims 9-22 stand rejected under 35USC103(a) based on the reference Miloslavsky in view of the cited reference Fletcher, et al, U.S. Statutory Invention Registration H1921. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Invention

In this application an invention is described that relies on the use of the general method call mechanism, of which CORBA is an example. The mobile terminal of this system uses a data oriented, general method call mechanism to communicate to an end service, i.e. a server, through a gateway. After a wireless communication utilizing the method call mechanism is established, a gateway performs protocol translation between wireless and wired protocols transparently. This is not taught in the cited references. In particular the reference Miloslavsky relies on the establishment of a live voice call through a WAP service provider (see claim 1). This is not a data oriented mechanism.

Miloslavsky describes only a server (WAP-ST), which can initiate a voice call to a desired number on behalf of a WAP device. The call can be initiated as a normal call (COST) or as a call made through Internet. This reference does not describe data exchange between a mobile terminal and the end service. The so called

"Intelligent routing decisions" cited by the Examiner do not use method calls and do not correspond to the invention, as described in the claims of this application.

Discussion of the Cited Reference

The Examiner relies on the reference Miloslavsky to support the rejection based on anticipation and as primary support for the rejection based on obviousness. Miloslavsky describes an extension to a WAP server, which allows a normal call to be made to an end service attached to the system. The establishment of a voice call is described. Miloslavsky does not describe data exchange between a mobile terminal and the end service, instead it relies on the WAP gateway to make a normal voice connection and only stored information relating to the identity and subscription of the user is sent to the end service. Miloslavsky does not describe how a mobile terminal communicates with the gateway, so it can be assumed that normal WAP browsing of WAP pages is used. The mobile terminal of Miloslavsky does not use method call mechanisms in the communications described, therefore, the actual service usage is not data oriented.

In the disclosure of Miloslavsky, "voice calls" are described, while in this application "method calls" are used. These method calls have nothing to do with voice calls. The system of Miloslavsky is not related to method calls, or service requests inside method calls.

Fletcher is about the network internal system for call establishment. The mobile terminal is not making CORBA method calls. The mobile terminal is establishing a normal voice (or data) call, and the specification describes how the network elements can use CORBA in verifying the user, routing the call

and performing number translations. The mobile terminal is not using method calls of CORBA-type, i.e. there is no wireless CORBA communication described.

The translation described in Fletcher is the translation of normal digits (normal telephone number) that may be modified before the call is forwarded to the network elements for routing setup. Protocol translations are not described. The system described in Fletcher is for establishing connections, for example, the establishment of a data call between a mobile terminal and internet service. The actual usage of the service is not described. No support for using a general method call mechanism in a mobile terminal is described. To the contrary, as the document states: "the mobile agent 2011 will receive the dialed digits in the unique mobile agent protocol".

The Issue of Anticipation

The Examiner is reminded that the anticipation analysis requires a positive answer to the question of whether the system of Miloslavsky would infringe the claims of this application, if it were later.

Claim 1 of this application contains the following features:

"at least a part of the communication of the apparatuses is arranged to be performed by means of method calls, each method call containing a service request,

one or more service brokers directing the service request contained in the method call to a given server, which is arranged to reply to the method call according to the required service by sending the information required for the service to the service broker which is arranged to send the information to the sender of the method call, and

an adapter which is connected to wireless apparatuses and which adapts the protocol used in the wireless connection to the rest of the network and which adapter is arranged to find the server providing the requested service on behalf of the apparatus which sent the method call and which operates in a wireless network"

Since none of the claimed features are present in the system of the reference Miroslavsky, there can be no infringement of the subject claims. Therefore the teaching of Miroslavsky does not support the rejection based on anticipation with respect to any of the claims.

These arguments apply equally to the rejected dependent claims.

The Issue of Obviousness

It is well settled that in order to establish a prima facie case for obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, without reference to the disclosure of this application.


Applicant submits that the above described deficiencies of the primary reference Miloslavsky are not remedied by the proposed combination with the teaching of the reference Fletcher as described above. The combined references do not, therefore, support a prima-facie case of obviousness. The modification of the teachings of Miloslavsky or Fletcher or both, in order to obtain the invention, as described in the claims submitted herein, would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

The above arguments apply equally to the rejected dependent claims.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,


Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.
Reg. No. 44,004

9 MARCH 2005
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 3/9/05

Signature: Doris W. Perman
Person Making Deposit